

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

By this amendment, claims 19-30 have been canceled and new claims 31-38 added. Thus, claims 31-38 are pending. Support for the claim recitations can be found at least at: Fig. 65; and column 49. If the Examiner requires further supporting passages, she is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

A substitute specification is filed herewith to make amendments to the specification. Also, proposed drawing amendments and new formal drawings incorporating the proposed drawing amendments are filed herewith. No new matter has been added.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for her time and consideration during the personal interview of July 3, 2003. The substance of the arguments presented to the Examiner during the interview are detailed below in response to the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action.

Claims 19, 21, 22, 27, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Judge. Claims 19, 21-23, 25-27, 29, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sullivan. Claims 19-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Marti. These rejections are traversed and are inapplicable to new claims 31-38.

Each of independent claims 31 and 33 includes a recitation of a decoder operable to decode a data stream to an HDTV signal, and each of method claims 35 and 37 includes a recitation of decoding a data stream to an HDTV signal. Marti does not disclose or suggest a method or apparatus for decoding a data stream to an HDTV signal. The system of Marti is a system for the processing of digital text data which is transmitted along with a standard analog television signal and is not a system for processing of HDTV signals.

Moreover, each of the independent claims 31, 33, 35, and 37 include a recitations drawn to examining the quality, or detecting the error rate, and outputting or stopping outputting of the HDTV signal accordingly. Thus, claim 31 recites a controller operable to examine the quality of the data stream, and an output unit operable to output the HDTV signal and to stop outputting

the HDTV signal when the quality of the data stream is lower than a predetermined acceptable quality for a predetermined period of time. Likewise, method claim 35 recites examining the quality of the data stream, outputting the HDTV signal, and stopping outputting of the HDTV signal when the quality of the data stream is lower than a predetermined acceptable quality for a predetermined period of time. Marti does not disclose or suggest examining the quality of a data stream that is to be decoded into an HDTV signal, and stopping outputting of the HDTV signal, which is decoded from the data stream, when the quality of the data stream is lower than a predetermined acceptable quality for a predetermined period of time.

Claim 33 recites a controller operable to detect an error rate of the data stream, and an output unit operable to output the HDTV signal and to stop outputting the HDTV signal when the error rate of the data stream is higher than a predetermined error rate for a predetermined period of time. Likewise, method claim 37 recites detecting an error rate of the data stream, outputting the HDTV signal, and stopping outputting of the HDTV signal when the error rate of the data stream is higher than a predetermined error rate for a predetermined period of time. Marti does not disclose or suggest detecting the error rate of a data stream that is to be decoded into an HDTV signal, and stopping outputting of the HDTV signal, which is decoded from the data stream, when the error rate of the data stream is higher than a predetermined error rate for a predetermined period of time.

Because of the distinctions discussed above, claims 31-38 are not anticipated by Marti.

With respect to Judge and Sullivan, it is noted that these references were not applied to claims 20, 24, and 28, which recited the outputting of the data stream when the data stream has a predetermined acceptable condition (or when the error rate of the data stream is lower than a predetermined error rate). Each of the independent claims now includes similar recitations, i.e., stopping outputting of the HDTV signal when the quality of the data stream is lower than a predetermined acceptable quality (or when the error rate of the data stream is lower than a predetermined error rate) for a predetermined period of time. Thus, the new claims recite not only the outputting of a signal when a predetermined acceptable condition or error rate exists, but stopping the outputting of the HDTV signal when a predetermined quality or error rate exists for


a predetermined period of time. Just as Judge and Sullivan do not disclose or suggest the limitations of previous claims 20, 24, and 28, they also do not disclose or suggest stopping outputting of the HDTV signal when the quality of the data stream is lower than a predetermined acceptable quality (or when the error rate of the data stream is lower than a predetermined error rate) for a predetermined period of time as now recited in new claims 31, 33, 35, and 37. Thus, claims 31-38 are not anticipated by Judge or Sullivan.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitsuaki OSHIMA et al.

By:


Jeffrey R. Filipek
Registration No. 41,471
Attorney for Patentees

JRF/fs
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 1, 2003